

DRAFT
Technical Issues Committee (TIC)
Meeting Notes
23 October 2006

Attendees:

Dan Odenweller, Central Valley Water Board
Stephen Clark, Pacific EcoRisk
Marshall Lee, California Department of Pesticide Regulation
Dave Ceppos, Center for Collaborative Policy
Susan Fregien, Central Valley Water Board
Dania Huggins, Central Valley Water Board
Bill Croyle, Central Valley Water Board
Tina Lunt, Sacramento Valley Water Quality Coalition
Claus Suverkropp, Larry Walker and Associates
Roberta Firoved, California Rice Commission (CRC)
Bill Thomas, South San Joaquin Water Quality Coalition
Jim Atherstone, South San Joaquin Irrigation District
Jay Rowan, Central Valley Water Board
John Swanson, Central Valley Water Board
Melissa Morris, Central Valley Water Board
Margie Lopez Read, Central Valley Water Board
Maryam Khosravifard, California Department of Food and Agriculture
Karen Johnson, Scharff
Krista Callin, University of California at Davis
Mike Johnson, University of California at Davis
Melissa Turner, University of California at Davis
Ken Landau, Central Valley Water Board
Sandy Nurse, Sierra Foothill Laboratory
Nasser Dean, Western Plant Health Association
Linda Deanovic, University of California at Davis
Kathleen Groody, State Water Resources Control Board
Johnny Gonzales, State Water Resources Control Board
Al Vargas, California Department of Food and Agriculture
Tim Johnson, California Rice Commission
Leticia Valadez, Central Valley Water Board

Current Action Items

1. Central Valley Water Board will provide all staff comments to the TIC about TIC recommendations in writing. Comments will no longer be provided solely in verbal format. Comments for recent recommendations are expected to be made available before the draft MRP is completed.
2. Staff to prepare comments on the TIC recommendations and advise about the probability to support the recommendations in a Tentative MRP. These comments will be brought forth to the December TIC meeting.

3. Staff will attempt to prepare a working draft MRP and share it with the TIC at the December meeting, assuming that this step is acceptable with the Executive Office.
4. TIC members will consider the list of potential topics for 2007 and bring forth ideas and suggestions to the December meeting.

Meeting Summary

- I. **Introductions and Announcements:** The agreed upon 2-step process for reaching consensus on recommendations for the MRP was described again. The agenda was reviewed, and an error was noted in that the Lab Round Table recommendation #4.2 had reached consensus at the September TIC meeting and did not need to be discussed again. That item was removed from the agenda.

An update was made regarding the Monitoring Workshop that had been scheduled for the October Board Meeting and to solicit participation by interested stakeholders. The timing of the workshop has not yet been finalized, although there had been a request by some to include the data from 30 December Semi-Annual Report in the Workshop. This will mean that the workshop will occur no sooner than March 2007.

There was also a discussion about the uncertainty of the timing of completing the Tentative MRP for public comment. This uncertainty is due to the wishes of the Executive Office to include some policy discussion with stakeholders on the policy issues in the MRP. It is not known who will be involved in the policy discussions, but it will not be done through the TIC – although there may be some overlap in individuals that participate in both. However, the intent of staff is to provide the TIC members with comments regarding all of the proposed recommendations, in addition to a working draft of the MRP. That same working draft will be shared with the members of the policy discussions, once that group is formed.

- II. **Triggers Focus Group Recommendation on Flow & Load (#6).** Mike Johnson spoke for Lenwood Hall, who was the author of the Flow and Load recommendation. Solutions to the uncertainties that were discussed in the September TIC meeting were addressed with language regarding identification of the level of uncertainty in any measure of flow. The recommendation achieved consensus by the TIC and it will be forwarded to Central Valley Water Board staff for comment.
- III. **Triggers Focus Group Recommendation for Follow-up to Failed Tests.** Stephen Clark presented the Triggers Recommendation #8, with a few minor changes that were made to address concerns expressed in the September TIC meeting. With some additional language revision by the TIC during this meeting, the recommendation achieved consensus by the TIC and it will be forwarded to Central Valley Water Board staff for comment.

IV. LRT Recommendation 2.2. – Field Duplicate criteria. This particular recommendation had been sent back from the TIC to the Focus Group several times, with requests for changes in the language. There continued to be discussion regarding the intent of the recommendation, and whether or not it was adequately addressing the objective behind the requirement for field duplicate analyses. Dave Ceppos recommended that the TIC work together to come up with language that they would prefer to see in the recommendation, rather than sending it back again to the Focus Group. Language was modified, and the recommendation did reach consensus. It will be forwarded to the Central Valley Water Board staff for comment.

V. TIC Plans for 2007. – Now that the discussion regarding technical recommendations for the MRP is coming to a close, it is appropriate timing for the TIC to decide upon the topics that they wish to discuss over the next 12-14 months, as well as the approximate schedule of meetings for this. Margie Lopez Read presented a short list of topics that had been put together from comments by TIC members. The group briefly discussed the list, and a few additions were made. It was decided that the plans for 2007 will be more completely discussed at the December meeting.

The need to have discussions regarding the interpretation of narrative objectives in the Basin Plan was brought forth. The concern is related to the selection of numeric limits for narrative objectives. This issue is partly technical, but largely policy. This can be a topic for future TIC meetings.

VI. Closing. – This October meeting marked a significant landmark for the TIC. All of the topics of concern that were discussed by the TIC early last winter have been addressed in one format or another. The last of the TIC recommendations reached consensus at this meeting. Both Bill Croyle and Margie Lopez Read expressed their appreciation for the tremendous effort that several TIC participants have put in place to make this happen. Dave Ceppos summarized the meeting and described the next steps which will include the following topics:

- A. Comments from Staff on the TIC Recommendations
- B. Expectations that the working draft MRP can be shared with the TIC
- C. Discussion for the structure of future TIC meetings and topics

The meeting ended at 1130.

Next Meeting:

The next meeting will be held on **Tuesday 12 December** at the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board office Training Room. It should be anticipated that the meeting will be a full day.

STATUS of Previous Action Items

1. TIC Members will develop alternative language to address concerns expressed about the Tentative MRP, page 8, last paragraph on Management Practices implementation. *(Item from February meeting – no recommendations received; no action has taken place)*
2. The SWAMP program will work with the Irrigated Lands Coalitions to 1) develop a crosswalk between ToxCalc and SWAMP, 2) provide training for utilizing the database, QAPP development, and 3) to solicit constructive comments and suggested changes for modifications that can be made to the database. *(Margie Lopez Read will communicate with Val Connor regarding the status of the crosswalk and training opportunities. No comments or suggestions received to date)*
3. TIC members wish to work on re-wording the ILP QAPP so that it is better coordinated with the SWAMP QAPP. A focus group (laboratory?) discussion for this will be arranged. *(Staff prepared a comparison table between the two QAPPs, and this was presented at the 9 May 2006 TIC meeting)*
4. TIC members are going to provide comment on the studies that are used to provide numeric interpretation of narrative quality objectives. The appropriate focus group may be the Triggers Focus Group. *(This was discussed at the 9 May 2006 meeting, and at the 13 June meeting)*
5. The Triggers group will continue to expand upon and improve the Options Table for storm water that was presented, and to draft up Problem Statements and language for a recommendation. *(no additional information has been submitted by members of the Focus Group)*
6. Language in the Tentative MRP will need to be clarified by staff so that the submittal of data for the ILP is consistent with SWAMP requirements . *(to be added by Staff with next version of a tentative MRP)*
7. Stephen Clark of Pacific EcoRisk, and Sandy Nurse of Sierra Foothill Labs will work on developing cost-estimates for a laboratory to submit electronic data in a SWAMP comparable format. *This was completed and presented at the 13 June 2006 meeting.*
8. Water Board staff will organize a presentation by Fish and Game regarding the Bioassessment project in Central Valley agriculture lands. *(This is tentatively postponed until the MRP recommendation process can be completed.)*

9. CCP will provide recommendations to staff about comment tracking protocols and methods to enhance readability of subsequent MRP recommendations/revisions from the TIC and Staff. *(to take place in near future)*
10. Staff and the TIC will further discuss the term “source” in a future meeting to ensure that there is shared meaning on the term and that there is clarity on it’s use. *(ideas for language alternatives were shared via email communications and language was modified for the TIC focus group recommendations presented at the 9 May 2006 meeting.)*
11. Focus groups will continue to meet to provide proposed recommendations for the 11 April meeting. *(done and will be continued)*
12. Central Valley Water Board staff will provide comments regarding the TIC Recommendation #1 at the 9 May 2006 TIC meeting. If there are questions or concerns from staff regarding the recommendation they can be discussed at that time. *(This was completed at the 13 June 2006 meeting)*
13. Central Valley Water Board Staff will re-introduce to the TIC the objectives behind the requirement for utilizing a SWAMP comparable format at the 9 May meeting. *(This did not occur, due to lack of time availability. The discussion will occur at a later date).*
14. Stephen Clark will work with the Laboratory Round Table to provide a comparison of the types of entries required by the SWAMP comparable database with a minimal submittal that might be considered necessary for compliance evaluation with the ILP. Real world examples of data entries will be used to the extent feasible. *This was completed at the 13 June 2006 meeting.*
15. Comments received on Triggers Group Recommendations 2, 3, and 4 will be addressed by the Focus Group, and the revisions will be recirculated to the TIC with the goal of ratifying these Recommendations on 9 May 2006. *(Done)*
16. Triggers Focus Group will consider developing recommendations for the scenario of a failed toxicity test and appropriate follow-up in order to address comments regarding TIC Recommendation #1. *(action still pending)*
17. Triggers Focus Group will work on minor language changes to the Recommendations #2-4, for which there was agreement by the TIC to forward them to Water Board staff.
18. FG Recommendation #6 will be routed to the entire TIC by email to see if any comments are made. If only minor changes are requested or suggested, the recommendation will be forwarded to Water Board staff as a comment to the tentative Conditional Waiver documents. *The Recommendation reached consensus*

and is being forwarded to the Water Board staff for consideration in the MRP and for comment by the September 2006 TIC meeting.

19. Sediment Toxicity Focus Group Recommendation #1 was presented at the 13 June 2006 meeting, for approval by the TIC. *After some modifications, the Recommendation was accepted by the TIC and forwarded to the Regional Board for comment at the September 2006 TIC meeting.*
20. TIC members should reviewed the Triggers Focus Group Recommendation #5 at the 11 July meeting and agreed that it be used as a recommendation to Water Board staff. *Comments will be provided from staff to the TIC at the September 2006 TIC meeting.*
21. The CVRWQCB staff did solicit comments from various programs at the CVRWQCB regarding Triggers Focus Group Recommendations 2-5, and for Sediment Toxicity Focus Group Recommendation #1. *These were presented at the 11 July 2006 meeting.*
22. The Sediment Toxicity Focus Group Recommendation #2 reached consensus during the August 2006 meeting and was forwarded to the CVRWQCB for comments.
23. The Triggers Focus Group Recommendation #5 was approved during the July TIC Meeting. Central Valley Water Board Staff will provide feedback in the near future on this recommendation and all of the TIC recommendations that have been reached.
24. The Triggers Focus Group Recommendation #6 on Flow and Load was approved during the October TIC 2006 meeting. Central Valley Water Board Staff will provide feedback in the near future on this recommendation and all of the other TIC recommendations that have been reached.
25. The Triggers Focus Group Recommendation #7 for Assessment Completeness reached consensus at the September 2006 TIC meeting and will be forwarded to the Central Valley Water Board staff for comment.
26. The Triggers Focus Group Recommendation for Follow-up to Failed Control Tests was presented (Recommendation #8), reached consensus by the TIC at the October TIC meeting. Central Valley Water Board staff will provide feedback in the near future on this recommendation and all of the other TIC recommendations that have been reached.
27. Minor language changes were made to the Laboratory Round Table Recommendation #1 (Performance Based Methods) which reached consensus during the August meeting. The minor changes were presented at the September meeting without disagreement. Central Valley Water Board Staff will provide feedback on this recommendation and others in the near future.

28. Laboratory Round Table (LRT) Recommendation #2.1 (Method Blanks) reached consensus at the 19 September TIC Meeting. Central Valley Water Board staff will provide feedback in the near future on this recommendation and all of the other TIC recommendations that have been reached.
29. LRT Recommendation #2.2 (Field Duplicates) reached consensus at the October 2006 TIC meeting. Central Valley Water Board staff will provide feedback in the near future on this recommendation and all of the other TIC recommendations that have been reached.
30. LRT Recommendation 3 (Field Exceedances), reached consensus at the 19 September meeting and will be forwarded to the Central Valley Water Board staff for comments.
31. LRT Recommendation 4.1 (Fenpropathrin), reached consensus at the 19 September meeting and will be forwarded to the Central Valley Water Board staff for comments.
32. LRT 4.2 (TOC) reached consensus at the 19 September meeting and will be forwarded to the Central Valley Water Board staff for comments.